

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2007 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11 and 12 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-14 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and the following remarks.

Support for the amendments to claims is at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. Particularly, support for amended Claims 1, 5, 7, 11 and 12 is at least found in originally filed Specification at Page 8, line 20 through Page 9, line 4 and Figure 4.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Examiner states that in line 2 of Claims 1 and 7, the phrase “and a output instruction signal line,” is grammatically incorrect.

Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 7 to correct the phrase “and a output instruction signal line,” with the phrase “and an output instruction signal line,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Entry of the claim amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant claim objections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that in line 1 of Claims 5 and 11, “the signal line,” is unclear as to which signal line Applicants are referring to.

In order to more clearly point out the Applicant's invention, Claims 5 and 11 have been amended to correct the phrase "the signal line" to read "the output instruction signal line."

Entry of the claim amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawaguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,592,199 (hereinafter "Kawaguchi"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Amended Claim 12 recites, *inter alia*:

"wherein the gate line and the output instruction signal line are disposed substantially parallel to each other on the same substrate, and
wherein the output instruction signal line is substantially a same length as the gate lines."

On page 5 of the Office action, and particularly illustrated in the attached FIG. 17 of Kawaguchi, the lines 131 and the first circuit wiring 173 of Kawaguchi are considered as disclosing the "gate lines" and the "output instruction signal line," respectively, of the claimed invention.

Kawaguchi discloses the electrode terminals 103 are connected to pixels via the lines 131. (See, Figure 18(a) and Col. 23, lines 41-50.) The first circuit wiring 173 of Kawaguchi is electrically connected to the flexible wiring board 104A which is electrically connected to another first circuit wiring 173, so that an electrical signal continues to flow in each first circuit wiring 173. (See for example, Figure 18(a) and Col. 23, line 41 to Col. 24, line 20.) That is, Kawaguchi does not disclose the first circuit wirings 173 being substantially a same length as the lines 131. Therefore, Kawaguchi does not disclose the gate line and the output instruction signal

line disposed substantially parallel to each other on the same substrate, and the output instruction signal line is substantially a same length as the gate lines of amended Claim 12.

Thus, Kawaguchi *fails to disclose* all of the limitations of amend Claim 12. Accordingly, Kawaguchi does not anticipate Claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claim 13 depends from Claim 12 and thus inherits all of the limitations of amended Claim 12 and is correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the relevant § 102 rejections and allowance of Claims 12 and 13 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 – 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi in view of Kubota et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,791,526 (hereinafter “Kubota”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Independent Claims 7 and 12 are amended similarly to independent Claim 1 and recite, *inter alia*, “...the output instruction signal line is substantially a same length as the gate lines.”

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 variously depend from Claims 1, 7 and 12, and inherit all of the limitations of amended Claims 1, 7 and 12, respectively. For all the reasons discussed above, Kawaguchi *fails to teach or suggest* the output instruction signal line is substantially a same length as the gate lines of similarly amended Claims 1, 7 and 12 and of Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 as depending upon Claims 1, 7 and 12.

Kubota is directed to a drive circuit. (See Title). Kubota is relied upon as disclosing that a timing of an output of image data is according to a delay of a gate driving signal. (See Figure 18). In addition, Kubota is relied upon as disclosing that specific gate lines are energized with the timing that corresponds to control signals from timing control circuits 5 and that thin film transistors of pixel cells connected to these gate lines are switched on at a same time. (See Col. 1, lines 60-65). Applicant respectfully submits that Kubota also does not *teach or suggest* the output instruction signal line is substantially a same length as the gate lines of amended Claims 1, 7 and 12, and of Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 as depending upon Claims 1, 7 and 12 and does not remedy the deficiencies of Kawaguchi.

Thus, Kawaguchi and Kubota, alone or in combination, *fail to disclose all of the limitations* of Claims 1, 7 and 12, and Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 as respectively depending upon Claims 1, 7 and 12. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding 1-11 and 14 with respect to Kawaguchi and Kubota.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-11 and 14 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the relevant rejections and allowance of Claims 1 – 11 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Amy Bizon-Copp/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: November 26, 2007